

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the remarks and analysis contained in the Office Action. Claims 1, 7, 13 and 14 are amended above. Claim 5 is cancelled. New claims 15 and 16 are added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

The rejection of claims 1, 5, 7-8, 10 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection based upon the *Baranda, et al.* reference (U.S. 2003/0092524). There is nothing in the *Baranda, et al.* reference that discusses or suggests stretching cords for purposes of lengthening them. As already pointed out by Applicant, the *Baranda, et al.* reference mentions a tension on the order of approximately 50 Newtons in paragraph 0035. That tension is not sufficient to stretch the cords in the *Baranda, et al.* reference in a manner consistent with how the cords in Applicant's pending claims are being stretched. Instead, the tension used in the *Baranda, et al.* reference is intended to hold the cords straight relative to a jacket material being applied as described in that reference. Merely holding cords straight or taut is not the same as stretching cords to increase their length. There is no anticipation.

The rejection of claims 7-10 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection based upon the *Prewo* reference. Applicant has already discussed this reference and why it does not teach stretching cords in a manner consistent with Applicant's claims in the recent appeal brief. There is nothing in the *Prewo* reference, for example, that is a teaching or suggestion regarding keeping cords stretched without any external load applied to a belt assembly. The only stretching (if any) mentioned in the *Prewo*

reference occurs as a result of an external load (e.g., the elevator and people within the elevator car) being applied to the belt of the *Prewo* reference. There is no anticipation.

**The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-13
under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn.**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection based upon the *Lambert* reference (1,412,310). The *Lambert* reference does not include using a noncompressible urethane material as a jacket. Instead, layers of fabric are laid between layers of cords in that reference. None of the claims are anticipated.

**The rejection of claims 1-3, 5-6 and 11
under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 based upon the *Prewo* reference in view of *Roberts* (3,441,641). There is no *prima facie* case of obviousness. Even if the proposed combination could be made, there is nothing that corresponds to or suggests stretching cords in a manner that increases a length of the cords as recited in Applicant's claims. The rejection must be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits that this case is in condition for allowance.

Applicant hereby petitions to extend the time for filing a response to the Office Action mailed June 11, 2008 for one month, the period to end on October 11, 2008. The Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482 in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds in

the amount of \$130.00, as well as for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS

By: /David J. Gaskey/
David J Gaskey
Registration No. 37,139
400 W. Maple Rd., Ste. 350
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 988-8360

Dated: October 14, 2008

N:\Clients\OTIS ELEVATOR\IP00194\PATENT\Response 9-08.doc